

## The University of Akron IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

6-6-2002

# Transcript of the Faculty Senate Special Meeting June 6, 2002

Elizabeth Kennedy  
[facultysenate@uakron.edu](mailto:facultysenate@uakron.edu)

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>

---

### Recommended Citation

Kennedy, Elizabeth. "Transcript of the Faculty Senate Special Meeting June 6, 2002." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 6 Jun 2002. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/112>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact [mjon@uakron.edu](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).

## MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL FACULTY SENATE MEETING ON JUNE 6, 2002

The special meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:05 p.m. on Thursday, June 6, 2002, in Room 202 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Thirty-four of the seventy Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators Belisle, Broadway, Gerlach, Holz, M.Huff, Lavelli, Li, Marino, Norfolk, R.Pope, Schmith, and Wyszynski were absent with notice. Senators Anderson, Binienda, Brouthers, Carri, Chafin, S.Clark, First, Graham, Kahl, Kinion, Laipply, Louscher, Pinheiro, Purdy, Redle, Sakezles, Stinner, Trotter, Turning, Wallace, and Walter were absent without notice.

Chair Sheffer began by stating that the purpose of the meeting this afternoon was to finish the agenda from the May 2 meeting and to attend to one piece of unfinished business, which was the PBC bylaw change. At this point, he called Associate Provost Nancy Stokes to the floor to report for the Academic Policies and Calendar Committee.

Associate Provost Stokes began her report by stating that there were several motions before the Senate, seven to be exact, and each would be addressed in order of appearance. **(See Appendix A).**

The first motion dealt with rule 3359-60-036 Graduation, regarding changes in the rule for graduation with honors. The rationale for the change was that people who were graduating with a second baccalaureate degree who had attained honors wished to be allowed to graduate with honors for a second baccalaureate degree, one unrelated to their first baccalaureate degree. The committee was proposing to remove the words "an initial" baccalaureate degree and change the credits from sixty to "sixty-four." Sixty was originally put in the rule because it was half of the 120, which was normal for graduation. But normal for graduation now was 128, so the committee was asking to raise it to 64. The other language added was the number of credit hours used to determine graduation with honors and included total numbers completed at the University plus the number of credit hours in progress. That was to address the issue of transfer students who completed 64 hours at The University of Akron and still wished to graduate with honors. Numbers (3) and (4) were being eliminated to be consistent with the General Bulletin changes.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of this motion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken, and the Senate voted its approval.

Associate Provost Stokes continued. The second motion was a course substitution policy. This was presented as a policy, not a rule, and would be included in the Undergraduate Bulletin. Senators were all aware that lots of times we substituted courses for students, and this policy was based on policies that were currently available in both the College of Arts & Sciences and the College of Fine & Applied Arts.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of motion no. 2. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The body voted its approval of motion no. 2.

Associate Provost Stokes continued with motion no. 3, which dealt with the presentation of honorary degrees. The University did not currently have a rule that addressed what process was put in place when someone requested an honorary degree. This would be a rule in the University Rules and

Regulations. It currently had no number because there was no rule now. This was referred to APCC by Faculty Senate to write the rule, which is now presented as a motion from APCC.

Senator Qammar then stated she recalled that the Law School had had some question about the timing of this. Had that been worked out?

Senator Jordan replied that the Law School had been advised that it did not apply to them and thus had no objections to this motion.

Chair Sheffer called for further discussion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken, and the body approved the motion.

Associate Provost Stokes continued with the fourth motion. This dealt with a clarification of early tenure language as it appeared in the University RTP Rule 3359-20-037. "The Academic Unit Tenure Committee shall vote to determine if the candidate may apply for early tenure. The decision of the Tenure Committee is final and cannot be appealed." The rationale was presented as part of the handout given to Senators.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion. Senator Yoder stated that, in the interest of having an opportunity to discuss this with our constituents during the regular academic year, she would like to make a motion that we postpone a vote on this particular item until the October meeting. This was seconded by Senator Riley. The Chair called for a discussion of Senator Yoder's motion. None forthcoming, the Senate voted to postpone motion no. 4 until the October 2002 Senate meeting.

Associate Provost Stokes continued with motion no. 5, concerning policies regarding student success and retention. These were policies; they were not rules. They had been presented to the Council of Deans by Dean Mugler from University College as clarifications and statements to address student success and retention. There were three statements. The first was: "Each course syllabus should clearly articulate an attendance policy that allows for some flexibility, accommodates late enrolling students, and includes a statement addressing acceptance policy for late work." So all syllabi would have to include information about attendance, and a statement as to whether late work would be accepted or not. The second statement was: "Students must successfully complete with a grade of C or better any developmental courses that may be required within the first 32 credit hrs. attended." The third was: "The deadline to withdraw from a course shall be Friday, the 10th week of the semester. The deadline shall be prorated for courses less than 15 weeks. Freshman mid-term deficiency grades shall be submitted by Friday of the 6th week of the semester." Those were the three statements.

Senator Qammar then had a question about statement number 2. If a student does not get a C or better, what happens? Also, was this not better communicated to the student if put in as a requirement for each of the courses, via curriculum proposals? So that as a student signed up for a course, he/she would see the requirement of C or better right there?

Associate Provost Stokes replied that that was certainly an alternative way to address it. And the consequence was, if it was developmental math, a student could not take the regular math sequence until he/she had a C or better in developmental. Senator Erickson then asked whether students were allowed to redo a course. Associate Provost Stokes replied, yes, but students could only retake a developmental course once. There was a limit.

Senator Qammar then stated she wished to make a motion to remove no. 2 and refer it back to APCC.

Senator Gunn seconded this motion. Associate Provost Stokes asked whether Senator Qammar was suggesting that APCC propose it be done as a curriculum change as opposed to a policy change. Senator Qammar indicated that she was. The Chair called for discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, the body voted its approval to refer statement no. 2 to APCC.

Senator Buckenmeyer then asked about statement no. 3. Was that date going to be published for prorated courses? Associate Provost Stokes replied that it could be published if we knew every single time frame of every single course. But for workshops, for example in the College of Education, unless we knew what those dates were, we could not prorate it.

Senator Buckenmeyer stated that we had a number of half credit hr. courses that went half a semester. So that date would not be published per se for those courses in the schedule of classes? Associate Provost Stokes replied that no, it would not. Senator Kennedy added that they were not currently published.

Senator Sterns added that another approach would be to ask that in each class it be specified as part of the course outline when that time period was reached. Have it as part of the course outline and the wording would be in terms of, "Following the sixth week deficiency grade in those classes which are of different time periods, a date would be set equivalent and formally part of the course outline."

This was offered as a friendly amendment and seconded. Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the amendment.

Provost Hickey then stated he was concerned about having 800 different people calculating what portion of the class it was. He liked the idea, but suggested that there be one calculation done for all of the regular courses and then that number be provided to people for their use. That would ensure consistency across the courses.

Senator Gunn added that we should have consistency; the University did need a policy. She was speaking for the amendment.

Associate Provost Stokes then asked Senator Sterns for clarification regarding the language of his friendly amendment. Could she suggest that in the second sentence where it said, "The deadline shall be prorated for courses less than 15 weeks," to put a semicolon and state, "This date for withdrawal shall be included in the syllabus?" Senator Sterns replied yes. Associate Provost Stokes then pointed out that that did not identify who was going to set the date.

Senator Erickson then raised a question. As the student representative was not present, she felt students would want to know what the APCC's rationale was for that change in no. 3.

Associate Provost Stokes replied that it had come from University College and dealt with student retention and success, particularly of undergraduate students. The idea of University College was that by the time the student got to the 12th week, it was too late for them to either redeem themselves or to get out with the ability to come back in and succeed in the future. She pointed out that she did not have all the information from University College with her to address this more fully.

Senator Sterns then stated that the point was that mid-semester, whenever that was, students were supposed to get a grade if they were not doing well. So it gave enough time for them to respond either by working out their deficiencies or dropping. That was the intention, to give enough time to take action.

Senator Erickson pointed out that the 12th week was the mid-term deficiency part of it. At the moment students were getting notice with very little time to drop. Associate Provost Stokes replied that that was correct. University College felt that that was too late. The deficiency came too late for students to get the grade in order to be able to drop. Senator Erickson then asked whether the deficiency grade would be submitted by the 6th week. Associate Provost Stokes replied that yes, based on the 10th week of withdrawal; deficiency now was the 8th week.

Senator Erickson then stated that we could have changed it to the 6th week and still had withdrawal at the 12th week. Therefore, she was wondering what the rationale was for changing it from the 12th to the 10th week? Even though the student representative was not here, the rationale should be provided.

Chair Sheffer stated that the body was addressing the amendment to no. 3 dealing with courses less than five weeks. Senator Buckenmeyer said he supported the amendment but wanted a point of clarification. Who would the instructors contact to find out what date that was? Associate Provost Stokes replied that for prorated classes, that had not been decided.

Provost Hickey asked whether they could not do the calculation and provide it to all of the deans so it could be distributed. Senator Gunn added that that was what was needed for faculty to include in their syllabi. Associate Provost Stokes replied that yes, they could do that.

Chair Sheffer called for further discussion of the amendment to no. 3. None forthcoming, a vote was taken and the body approved the amendment. He then directed discussion back to nos. 1 and 3.

Senator Lyons then spoke, asking for clarification. He had been here six years and he was not quite sure what deadline for withdrawal meant. It seemed like students could withdraw any time they wanted even after the deadline. Did this deadline mean when they could not withdraw without a financial penalty or without getting a W on their report?

Senator Erickson added that as far as she knew, students could withdraw up until that point, and after that they could not unless there was some special case. In that instance, special cases had to go through the dean's office.

Senator Lyons then asked whether this was the deadline where after this students would still get an F if they tried to withdraw. Associate Provost Stokes replied that students could not withdraw, so they got whatever they had earned. There were earlier deadlines for signatures - withdrawal with only the instructor's signature, etc.

Senator Lyons added that the 12th week felt to him like practically the end. Associate Provost Stokes concurred, pointing out that that was why the committee wanted to change it.

Senator Qammar then offered a friendly amendment. Could we take the freshman mid-term deficiency grades and make that sentence no. 4? No. 4 was really instructions for faculty. She would like to put a 4) in front of the word, "freshman," now creating four statements instead of three.

Senator Drew offered a friendly amendment to the friendly amendment. She wanted to strike "mid-term." We were at the 6-week mark of a 15-week semester, and that was misleading if we're doing deficiency at six weeks. That was not the middle of the term. Associate Provost Stokes agreed.

Senator Qammar then had another question. Now that grades were submitted on the web, how long did it actually take for students to review their grades immediately? Regardless of whether or not she agreed with moving the deadline for withdrawal back to the 10th week, by the 6th week in the semester she was not sure a student or a faculty member had a very good idea as to the true potential. She would rather go to the 8th week and leave withdrawal till the 10th week for freshmen only. She proposed that as an amendment; Senator Spiker seconded it.

Senator Yoder added that one of the things she had discovered as she taught a 400-level course that included freshmen was that she did not have assessments that early in the semester. So unless we kept freshmen in freshmen-level classes, this got really restrictive on those of us who teach upper-level classes. She supported moving it to 8 weeks.

Senator Kennedy then pointed out that if faculty did not have deficiency grades for freshmen, then they had nothing to report. What we were talking about was identifying students who were failing; those were the ones who needed to be identified. As someone who had plenty of freshmen in her courses, she could state that the 6th week was just enough time to start getting their attention that they needed to do something.

Senator Erickson replied that she agreed entirely with Senator Kennedy. Grades were submitted only for failing students. You may not get them all, but you were going to get most of them and that was what was important. Senator Kennedy added that it was a good safety net.

Senator Spiker then stated that even in a freshman class, six weeks was still very early for some of the projects and so forth. You would not always catch them. She was speaking for eight weeks.

Senator Hajjafar then stated that it was his experience that when the students came from high school for math classes, a lot of them did a bad job for the first test because they wanted to study the same way they had studied for high school. Then if we made this six weeks, the first test was the terminator and a lot of them would withdraw from the course. That would be a disaster. We needed eight weeks to give them another chance to see whether they could bring their grades up and could make it up. Students could decide by the 10th week whether they wanted to stay or not. We would have a lot of students with the potential to raise their grades, but by six weeks they would withdraw.

Senator Harp offered a friendly amendment. How about the 7th week?

Senator Qammar stated she thought Senator Hajjafar had exactly the right idea, that someone who was truly, truly deficient needed to have two data points. A freshman student who had not gotten into very good study habits within the first four weeks of school was going to get this deficiency grade. They would already have gotten their test scores back; they were just not going to really believe they could not pull it off in the end. A little bit farther into the semester, when now you were halfway through with a deficiency grades, was a much bigger wake-up call that they had lost the time to make it up.

Senator Erickson then stated that Associate Provost Stokes had made the argument from University

College that this whole thing started with precisely this deficiency timing. They really were strong about having that deficiency grade in earlier; is not that what she heard the Associate Provost say? It was not that students could not make the grade up; they should be able to. If those grades were not recorded as final grades, they were just information to the students. It would seem that early information was better than late information because the later they got it the less they could do about it.

Senator Hajjafar stated that six weeks was somehow breaking down because they wanted to have enough time to report to get to the students. But right now the system was that faculty reported at the 8-weeks grade. The next day students had the grade and still had two weeks time to decide. He dealt with about a thousand freshmen each semester and nobody had that experience. He knew that six weeks would scare a lot of students and create a lot of unnecessary withdrawals.

Senator Barrett then asked how these grades were communicated to the deficient freshmen. In other words, did they have to look on the web in order to find them, or were they mailed to them?

Senator Hajjafar replied that they were mailed to them. Senator Barrett said that if they were mailed, that would take too much time. Senator Hajjafar replied it was email; when we gave the grades, the next day they had it.

Senator Barrett then stated that if students had to look on the web in order to see final grades, and they did not know they had to look on the web at eight weeks, this would not be a good method for them.

Senator Riley stated that she would like to see Senator Barrett's question addressed. Was this going to be an email thing that students logged on and found out, or were these going to be mailed home to them?

Senator Robert Huff asked how it was being done currently. Provost Hickey replied that his understanding was that University College used this as an early warning and that they notified the students and worked with the students, but he did not know how they notified them. However, given the number of questions Senators had, the body might want to defer this issue and invite Dean Mugler to attend a Senate meeting and explain this.

Senator Dechambeau made this motion; Senator Erickson seconded it.

Associate Provost Stokes then repeated statement no. 1, "Each course syllabus shall clearly articulate an attendance policy that allows for some flexibility, accommodates late-enrolling students, and includes a statement addressing acceptance policy for late work."

Senator Calvo asked whether this was only for freshmen courses. Associate Provost Stokes replied that, no, this would apply to all courses. Senator Calvo added that now we had an attendance policy that allows for some flexibility. What did that mean? Associate Provost Stokes replied that the flexibility was for extenuating circumstances.

Senator Rasor-Greenhalgh stated that she believed there was a policy already in the Bulletin regarding this. Senator Qammar added that the policy in the Bulletin said students were expected to attend all classes.

Senator Kennedy then pointed out to the body not to lose sight of the forest for the trees. This whole

issue was a policy statement addressing students' success and attention. The idea was, what else could we do to keep students from leaving? It was not to dictate our syllabi, but it was how to make students stick around.

Senator Spiker stated that there was already a policy in the Bulletin. Would not that be a better place to allow for some flexibility in that statement as opposed to one after each and every syllabus? The policy in the Bulletin was very inflexible and students had to be in class, if that was what was said.

Associate Provost Stokes replied, no, students were expected to attend all classes. Senator Spiker then added that the Bulletin would be a good place to simply add a statement like this to allow for some flexibility. Associate Provost Stokes pointed out that all these statements would be put in the Bulletin anyway.

Chair Sheffer added that it also depended on the good judgment of faculty members. Some faculty members imposed their own rule system whether they were sufficiently recognized or not.

Senator Kennedy added that this also assumed that all the freshmen students were going to read the Bulletin cover to cover.

Chair Sheffer then called for further discussion on statement no. 1. None forthcoming, a division of the house vote was taken. Statement no. 1 failed by a vote of 20 to 10.

Associate Provost Stokes addressed the next motion, no. 6, part-time faculty rule changes, rule 3359-20-061. This was an executive summary because it was quite an extensive part-time faculty rule. The definition of part-time faculty (A) had sections added to clarify responsibilities. Sections (B), (C), and (D) were definitions of the teaching portfolio, relevant experience, and excellence in teaching. What started this discussion was that Faculty Senate asked for the definition of relevant experience. So we took it back to the part-time faculty and asked them to address the entire issue. Letter (E) had remained unchanged, assignments and teaching loads, but had been moved geographically in the document itself. Letter (F) recommended privileges, used to be (C). Letter (G) recognition, used to be (D), so these were just geographic moves not changing language at all. Letter (H) used to be (E) so it got moved; again, there were no changes in the salary and grade levels. However, under associate lecturer and senior lecturer, items (2) and (3) had been added and there had been clarification of when a juris doctorate counts as a doctoral-level degree. There were added details in (H) for initial and existing part-time faculty classification. Letter (I) was detailed criteria for changing grades. It replaced the former letter (I). Letter (J) incorporated the former (F). Geography moves were listed there, and health insurance information obtained from HR that was not previously included. Letter (R) was responsibilities not required of part-time faculty, and (S) was geographically moved. Much of it was geographic changes. The substitute changes were the definition of relevant experience, which now appeared to be clearly defined, and the changes in the classification of associate lecturer items 2 and 3 and senior lecturers items 2 and 3 declaring juris doctorate. Those were the substantive changes.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the changes to rule 3359-20-061. Senator Kennedy then offered a friendly amendment regarding responsibilities of part-time faculty. This was under (A) under (1) on the first page. In terms of student grades and maintaining the confidentiality of records, there was probably a lot more that part-time faculty should also be responsible for, at least listed in terms of keeping attendance information, i.e., a veteran or a student athlete. If there were discrepancy reports that needed to be filed, anything specifying these would be helpful. This should either be included as



part of (D) or made into a new letter, something about managing appropriate student records. It was more than just keeping grades and maintaining confidentiality.

Associate Provost Stokes stated she had spoken with Senator Kennedy before this meeting and would accept that friendly amendment. She would ask that it be included as a letter (i) or inserted somewhere in these responsibilities rather than trying to enumerate everything we could think of. Therefore, (A)(1)(i) would be, "manage appropriate student records."

Senator Drew offered a friendly amendment to this. She suggested that, after appropriate records, to add, "as determined by the department," so that appropriate was not left up to the part-time instructor.

Senator Yoder then added that in the interest of soliciting feedback from part-time faculty, she would like to make a motion that we postpone action on this item until the Oct. Senate meeting. Associate Provost Stokes then added that this was in fact coming from part-time faculty.

Senator Yoder stated she thought that the Senate still would like to be informed about some of these things, especially the new pieces. So she thought it was in the interest of the Senate to be informed by some part-time faculty that we would like to have some time when they were around to do that.

Senator Yoder made the motion; Senator Lyons seconded it. Chair Sheffer called for discussion on the motion to postpone.

Senator John asked whether all this was coming from the part-time faculty information, and whether they had discussed it. Associate Provost Stokes stated that yes, they had discussed this in committee.

Senator Erickson stated she was glad that Senator Yoder had brought this up because she had been trying to talk to every Arts & Science member. Our dean's office had had a real problem with the 21 total credit hrs. Associate Provost Stokes replied that legally, we could not increase it over 21 according to the former University Council.

No further discussion of the motion to postpone forthcoming, the Chair then called for a vote. The body voted its approval to postpone motion no. 6.

Associate Provost Stokes continued with the final motion, salary rules changes. The task force concerning merit adjustments and criteria for merit met all fall semester and presented their findings. Senators saw a draft of those findings in Dec. to APCC, who said they were not ready to submit it to Senate at that time. APCC worked on that draft all during spring semester, and this was the result of that work during the spring semester. So it was the revision to the draft in Dec. that was being presented as a motion to Faculty Senate.

Senator Yoder stated that, again, given the seriousness of some of the issues raised in this motion and the fact that we got it at a time when the faculty were not on campus, she would like to move that we postpone action on this motion until the Oct. Senate meeting. Senator Qammar seconded her motion.

No discussion of the motion to postpone forthcoming, the Chair called for a vote. The body voted its approval of the motion to postpone motion no.6.

The chair of the Curriculum Review Committee then provided Senators a written report. (See **Curriculum Proposals, Appendix B.**)

Senator Franks, reporting for the Athletics Committee, stated his report was written as well. (See **Appendix C.**)

Senator Sterns then began his report from the Campus Facilities Planning Committee (**Appendix D**). The major focus of the committee's meeting on April 18 was having Dr. Angelo, the Associate Provost of Teaching & Learning, present the plans for Leigh Hall. He was asking for Senate approval of the plans for Leigh Hall renovations so that the chair of Campus Facilities Planning Committee could sign off on formal documents of receipt. He had not yet received formal space permission slips and/or accompanying detailed information which usually was required. However, that was coming and in spirit the committee had approved it. He was asking for authorization so he could sign off and it could move forward for action. What was important about this was whether the long distance learning classrooms would be available for general use. The answer was yes. A number of major renovations were taking place, and the space was going to be made so we could have a number of different sized distance learning classrooms. We will have 14 nicely done classrooms. It did not solve all of our classroom needs but would certainly contribute. We do not have enough money to change Knight Auditorium. Some people wanted to keep that large lecture hall available. I know, however, that there were plans down the road to change it, and that certainly could happen. There were unassigned areas that need to be settled as well. But in general, the plan for the building looked very positive. He asked for comments and, if there were none, that the resolution be approved.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The body voted its approval of the resolution.

Senator Sterns continued. The next issue was a request from the Dean of Arts & Sciences that we officially use the name Arts & Sciences Building for the present time period until a more formal name was designated. He reminded Senators that Dr. Gerlach had mentioned names for the building; however, that often was not in the purview of our committee. This was the first time in many years that the committee had forayed into this area, so we were asking that the Senate recommend that the name College of Arts & Sciences be used for the new building for the present time period.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The body voted its approval of the resolution.

Senator Sterns stated that the last topic concerned money for the various moves and where that was coming from. The committee had taken the position for many years that that was part of the general operating costs of the University. Mr. Nettling was asked to get estimates. Senator Sterns stated that this was a very serious issue, because just billing back to the departments' budgets was not the answer. We had taken a position many years ago that when moves of this type were for the good of the University as a whole, that such costs should be part of the budget account. He wanted to inquire of Mr. Nettling or the Provost what was happening.

The body gave its permission for Mr. Nettling to speak.

Mr. Nettling replied that the funding for the external mover had been made available.

Senator Sterns continued by stating that the committee wanted to enter into the record the resolution that the Campus Facilities Planning Committee request that PBC be notified of any moving expenses associated with planned buildings, and in this case PBC should find what was needed for the present move.

Senator Erickson stated that the first part of the resolution was fine. Provost Hickey then said he did not know whether he could offer a friendly amendment, so he wanted to state it and then someone else could. A recommendation that costs associated with moves into new buildings be considered at the time of the overall cost of the building and be included in those discussions and calculations would probably be a very helpful recommendation. Thus, we would really be budgeting for all costs associated with the building, including moving costs.

Senator Erickson stated that that was the intention of the resolution. However, the committee was not sure whether the borrowed funds could be used for the moving or not.

Provost Hickey replied that he was not sure that that was the important point. In some cases they might be able to, but in most cases he thought they could not. But the point was that other funds needed to be escrowed at that point in time in order to cover the moving costs. Senator Erickson concurred and stated that PBC needed to know that when it was part of the budget.

Chair Sheffer called for wording on the friendly amendment. Provost Hickey provided it, stating, "In making plans for new construction or renovations, costs associated with the move or moves should be determined and factored into the overall cost of the project." There was then some discussion about whom should be the recipient of that information - PBC, CFPC?

Senator Kennedy then provided the wording, "When planning for new construction or renovations, the costs associated with the move(s) should be predetermined and factored in and that this information be sent to PBC."

Senator Sterns then moved to offer this as a friendly amendment. Senator Riley asked for clarification. Did this imply the overall estimate or overall costs? Senator Qammar then added a sentence, "Such costs be included in the annual budget plan during the year of the move."

Provost Hickey replied that the reality was that you had to find the money sometime, and it made more sense to make a reasonable prediction of those costs up front, and then escrow money at that point in time since you could only spend money once. It did not mean there would be other things we could not do, but it also meant that we did not get to the point of people moving into the building and wondering whether we had enough money to buy the boxes and the tape. So it was just a more proactive way of dealing with all of the costs associated with new buildings.

Senator Sterns pointed out that that had been the principle of the committee for many years. It just had to be revisited again.

Senator Lee then asked for clarification. This was \$500,000 of expenses that was not budgeted that we were now being told the money was found to pay. Having worked with the budget all year, where did that money come from?

Mr. Nettling reiterated what he had said earlier, that we budgeted for the external movers. As he recalled, the \$500,000 also included things like repainting, carpet, and so forth. The cost of the external mover was coming from plant funds, and those who were on PBC know that there was a dollar amount available out of the general fund to plant funds.

Provost Hickey asked Mr. Nettling whether he remembered what the move itself was. Mr. Nettling replied he did not. Provost Hickey stated he thought it was in the 100-150 range. Those moving wanted the space they were moving out of refurbished and in some cases rebuilt for the next people moving in. Now most of those requests were not terribly unreasonable, but there were a few places that he thought might have been a little questionable. So he had talked with the people in Facilities Management, and the problem was not that they could not do it and cover the cost of it, but that the original request wanted everything finished before anybody else moved in. The only way that could be accomplished was to outsource all of the work, which would drive the cost up. So what all parties had agreed to was the reasonable work - repainting, cleaning, recarpeting or cleaning of existing carpet - would take place as a part of the normal scheduling of the Facilities & Management people at no cost to the department. They were willing to do that if it could be done over the next 6 to 12 months. The extreme costs were associated with hiring outside people to come in and do it all immediately, and that was what we were not able to do.

Senator Erickson asked whether the Provost was saying that that was not over \$500,000. The Provost replied that there was a normal routine maintenance that was covered in the budget of the Facilities & Management people. That budget would be tapped to do all of these subsequent changes. The total amount of money we were talking about for the move was well under \$200,000, and that was taken out of plant funds which just about totally exhausted all of the plant funds for the year.

Senator Sterns then pointed out that the critical issue here of course was planning and making sure we had a step-by-step process we went through to accomplish these goals.

Senator Harp then asked whether the 500,000 included the issue of bookshelves for a lot of departments in Arts & Sciences moving into the new building. One department had wall-mounted bookshelves on one wall where they were used to having two walls. Other departments had been reduced to about 20% of bookshelf space from their old space into their new space. He was wondering whether the 500,000 would help to offset that or whether we would be coming back asking for more money later?

Senator Sterns then stated that the issue of bookshelves was discussed and the question was whether people could take their bookshelves along. At one point the answer was yes. Why should not a faculty member be able to put their entire library in their new office? We have had situations in past years where because of construction techniques we had not been able to hang shelves where we used to. Most of those had not been major problems, but a lot of this should be settled at a much lower level than the Faculty Senate. The real issue was getting everything in synchrony with the Facilities Planning office, but the one thing that was clear was that the planning process must be faculty sensitive so that moves took place when it was appropriate for faculty. We must get the facilities planning operation to be sensitive to meeting the academic calendar so it did not disrupt our main functions. Senator Sterns thought they had a very good working relationship, and if there were problems with bookshelves, Senator Harp should have his department formally contact the committee to take action.

Chair Sheffer then asked Senator Kennedy to read the motion. Senator Kennedy stated: "CFPC requests that when planning for new construction and/or renovations, costs associated with such moves should be predetermined and factored into overall costs. This information should then be sent to PBC. Such costs are to be included in the annual budget plans of that year."

The Chair called for more discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The body voted its approval of the motion.

Senator Franks then began his report from the Planning and Budgeting Committee (**Appendix E**). He pointed out to Senators that the written report he had provided at the last Senate meeting gave a good summary of the committee's activities for the year. He also stated that the addendum provided at this meeting concerned the PBC's meeting since the last Senate meeting.

Senator Franks stated that there were a few items of carryover from the final report he wanted to bring to the Senate's attention. The first was the question about differential tuition that was raised when we approved the final budget. This was sent back to PBC for further study because basically we ran out of time and had been referred until Fall as the first item of business for the new committee in the Fall. In the meantime PBC was going to collect more information on the differential tuition to try to have a better understanding of it. It just was not possible to throw that together at the last minute; it was too complex.

Another thing the committee had done was look at the ROI numbers. On May 30, PBC met and agreed that as a method of softening the blow this year, that we would not take money from the colleges that did not meet the 1.7 ROI. We would still try to reward the colleges that did meet or exceed the 1.7 ROI. The reason we wanted to move forward with this was largely due to the NCA. We had to show that we were doing something to address the issue of basing our budgeting on productivity. So a group agreed to do that, and that amount was somewhere around \$550,000. Once we figure out where that will be coming from we would have another report for the entire PBC and the Executive Committee. Right now the recommendation was that we had it in place this year to show some progress.

The other thing the committee had said it was going to do was to bring a resolution to the floor to approve a template for quality measures. However, time ran out on that as well.

The committee had had a pretty good template that we were going to ask Senate to recommend, but again, his feeling was that that was more of a last-minute type of thing and there were too many last-minute things going on. So his recommendation was that we did not try to do something with the quality side for July 1.

The productivity side of the ROI was a formula that came up with numbers that were valid numbers, so to apply that you really did not need the quality side. That would be the second item of business for the new committee next year, to further refine these quality measures and get that side of the equation in place.

The third thing he wanted to address was addendum item no. 2. One of the biggest frustrations PBC had had in three years was timing, the issues of timing and availability of information and the calendar. A couple of years ago we approved a calendar that was a 2-page calendar that basically went something like - week 5 we do this, week 7 we do this, week 10 we do this, and then at the end of those weeks

we have a budget. We tried to stick to that and kept bringing it back to the table, but managing the shortfall and other things got in the way and it was really hard to keep the group focused on that. It was not a complete calendar in that it did not link all units on campus. It did not provide for a way to bring all of the input in at the time we needed it. What we were proposing to do, and, if successful it would solve all of the mechanistic-sort of problems that PBC faced, and would give us a template that included things such as when information needed to come from various vice presidents' divisions when we needed to submit things to the Senate. If we were successful, this would solve this.

A good example would be the 1.7 million that we saw from the VPCIO division for the first time about two weeks before we had intended. The committee looked at that and what it was. We got an explanation, but it took a week or two to get a full and comprehensive explanation. We had to hear from Dr. Gaylord, we had to hear from Mike Cheung, from CCTC. So if we could put this template together and have it in place, that would solve that problem. That was why we were going ahead with this; that part which would be more or less a highly collaborative process. So there would be plenty of opportunity to look at it.

Senator Yoder had a comment, and it was not to postpone anything. She did however, have a question about a postponed item regarding the item of the budget that was not acted on by the Board of Trustees regarding the shortfall and the possible give-backs. And as a part of that also, it was her understanding with more and more talk in the newspaper about the possibility of give-backs, (the most recent rumor heard was that we might be hit with another \$1 million give-back), could Senator Franks comment on the second part but also give us an update on what happened with the budget that was taken to the Board?

Senator Franks stated he did not know anything about a give-back. Once the budget went to the President, PBC did not have anything else to do with it. He would ask Dr. Hickey to reply.

Chair Sheffer then asked Provost Hickey to speak to no. 7 and particularly no. 8. Provost Hickey replied that no. 7, the differential tuition, had already been dealt with. The issue of were we going to see any more budget cuts – there were as many responses or ideas to that as people would ask. Right now the only thing he could say with any confidence was we would not be cut any more this fiscal year. So rest easy for 24 more days. Beyond that he did not know. Most people felt there probably would not be any reductions until after elections, which occurred in November. But after that no one really knew what was going to happen. The reality was that the state budget was met this year, but piecing together a lot of one-time monies. As he understood it, all of the reserve fund was gone. They borrowed from the tobacco settlement money; they had taken every loose one-time dollar that was available to cover the \$1.9 billion deficit that they had had this year. They were anticipating comparable deficits in each of the next two years of the next biennium. And he was told when he was in Columbus a week ago that the University should not anticipate any new money until the 06-07 biennium, so that was obviously a long way off. There were certainly those out there who were fairly confident that higher education would be cut again sometime during the next fiscal year. How much the cut would be and whether or not it would occur, he did not know. There obviously were a lot of efforts going on to try to prevent that from happening. But state revenues were still falling short of projections, and every month that passed and that happened we went in deficit. So you could rest easy through the rest of June, but after that all bets were off.

Now Senator Yoder's last question, item 8 – he had talked to the President about that at length and his position was that he felt, as in the letter he wrote to Dr. Sheffer, that he had already addressed that. He

had not seen any additional justification for why the Senate basically flip-flopped the percentages from the way the cuts were going to be made before, and he did not feel the urgency to deal with that right now because we did not even know whether we would have a budgetary problem. The budget was built around \$2.2 million shortfall, and it was covered was estimating enrollment increases of 4%. Four percent enrollment increases would neutralize the deficit. The budget was built assuming a 2% increase and with a 2.2 million deficit, an additional 2% increase in enrollment would cover that. So if we got a 4% increase in enrollment Fall semester, then there would not be a deficit based on the way the budget was built right now. If there was not a 4% increase, then there would be a deficit that would have to be made up. How that deficit was made up was the point of item no. 8. The recommendation was that the budget cuts be apportioned as they were before based on the percentages of the budgets, and each unit would have a portion of the cut proportional to its budget. The Senate recommendation was that a greater percentage be covered by the non-academic units than by the academic units. The President's position was that until we were faced with actually having to make that decision, until he understood the rationale for why the Senate proposed that, he was not prepared to accept or reject the recommendation that came forward.

Chair Sheffer then offered a comment. In the letter he had gotten from President Proenza which Senators had seen at the last Senate meeting, he was waiting to see the rationale. The report of the minutes of the March 21 meeting when that was changed provided the rationale. He had not heard from the President that he had seen or read the rationale. Chair Sheffer stated he would like to now know what the President thought about it, as he had read the rationale from the discussion that the Senate had at that time.

Provost Hickey then stated that the Executive Committee could certainly add that as a topic of discussion during its next meeting with the President.

Senator Franks then added that as it was usually several weeks into the fall semester that we got a final revenue figure for Fall, it might be something to be addressed again in October. Everybody would have more information then also.

Senator Yoder then asked whether we had any information about what other universities had done. She had heard informally that Ohio State, for example, took more of its cuts from the administrative side than the academic side. That had not been uncommon throughout the Ohio system and wondered whether Senator Franks was aware of that? Senator Franks replied that he was, but did not know the specifics. He did know that last year during the cuts, the academic side gave up 40% and the administrative side gave up 60% but he did not know the details. We spoke with three people from the state, Jack Hershey and a man named Cummins, in the Office of Budget and Management or OBM. But they and others at the state level had said that in 2006-07 would be the first time there could be any new money. Now that was assuming that this present administration stayed in office and that there were no plans for new income taxes. The proposed cigarette tax which started out somewhere around \$1 ended up being around 31 cents. So they did the minimum they could do in order to balance the budget with that and raiding the \$600 million rainy day fund and a few things that Dr. Hickey spoke of. He had not left the state government offices with a lot of confidence but with a lot of information.

Senator Franks ended his report by stating that as an outgoing who took a lot of incoming, he wanted to rise by saying that he had learned a great deal this year. Despite the fact that we had had some disagreements and the atmosphere on campus was tense, it was a very healthy experience for all of us on PBC, and the administration. Next year was going to be interesting too. He would not be on PBC

anymore but he had a lot of information and a lot of notes to pass on to the next person, so whoever the committee chose would be well-equipped to start the year.

Chair Sheffer then directed the Senate to address its unfinished business. The Senate had before it one item, the PBC bylaw change from the month of May (**Appendix F**). No. 3359-10-02(4)(d) and (f), and (d) is proposed to be changed to read: "The Senior Vice President and Provost shall act as co-chair of the committee. A senatorial co-chair shall be elected for a 2-year term by the full Senate at its September meeting, and a slate of candidates who are either Senators or Senate-eligible designates. The Senatorial co-chair is eligible for a course reduction or stipend similar to that of the Senate chair. A meeting of the committee shall be called at the request of either co-chair." Secondly, under part (f), "The Senatorial co-chair of the committee shall report to the Senate at regularly scheduled Senate meetings. The Senatorial co-chair shall present to the Senate the committee's recommendations regarding the planning and budgeting calendar, planning assumptions, the University plan, University budget consistent with the planning and budgeting calendar. The Senatorial co-chair will also regularly report to the full committee of the actions and comments of the Senate." Those were the major changes, to change the name from the vice chair making a Senator the co-chair of the PBC and some additional changes.

Senator Qammar stated that she wanted to strike, "or Senate-eligible designee." The amendment stated that the Senatorial co-chair should be elected for a 2-year term and then people who were either Senators or Senate-eligible designees. Now that we had said it was a 2-year term, did we have to also say Senate-eligible designees? If that person was elected for a 2-year term and went off Senate, they still would have been elected for a 2-year term. So they had to start at the election point being a Senator.

Senator Erickson seconded Senator Qammar's motion. Senator Yoder then pointed out that the reason it was there was because we discussed having a co-chair of PBC who might have experience we wanted to draw upon but who was not a Senator, at which point that person would be eligible to serve. So that was what it was intended to capture.

The Chair called for further discussion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken on the amendment to strike said phrase. The motion failed. Discussion continued on the bylaw change.

Senator Calvo then asked whether there was any discussion at any point of having a co-chair-elect being elected one year in, so that someone who might succeed the co-chair after two years would then have a year's experience before they actually stepped in as chair?

Chair Sheffer replied that that was not discussed, but the Executive Committee was examining the bylaws and particularly PBC this summer and certainly would take that into consideration.

Senator Franks then added that he saw a problem if this would create a 2 or 3-year term for the chair. There was no provision to guarantee that the chair-elect would be elected again for the Senate, so it got a little complicated.

Senator Calvo pointed out that it was a Senate-eligible designee, not a Senator. Senator Franks then stated that it was certainly something the Executive Committee could look at this summer when they looked at the PBC bylaws.

Senator Lyons then stated, if there were any support for it, that he would like to offer an amendment to



have it read, "eligible for a course reduction and a stipend." Chair Sheffer then rephrased this for Senator Lyons, stating he would have to strike "similar to that of the Senate chair." The motion to change it from "for" to "and," from court reduction and stipend. Senator Hajjafar seconded the motion by Senator Lyons.

Senator Franks stated he would support that motion because the process was very complex. PBC had done 60-70% of what we should have done. In putting together the structure for the budget calendar, there were so many other facets and aspects to the planning and budgeting process that if there were not some incentive for someone from the Senate to do this it was going to be very hard to find well-qualified, strong individuals to do this. Also, in some cases individuals were actually punished in a way in that their productivity in their department fell and then their merit suffered. There was a trade-off. So he very much supported this.

Senator Kennedy made a point of clarification - the Senate chair did not get a stipend, but the Senate Secretary did; it was six load hrs. Chair Sheffer then asked whether Senator Lyons would change that similar to that of the Secretary of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, and Senator Lyons asked whether he could simplify the amendment. He recommended that it be changed to a course reduction and a \$1,000 stipend, eliminating "similar to the Senate chair." Senator Hajjafar stated that although he thought \$1,000 was not enough, he would second the amendment.

Senator Erickson then spoke against the amendment. She thought if you put in a specific number in the bylaws, taking into account economy changes, inflation, etc., she did not think this wise. Not that there should be no compensation, but putting in actual numbers was not good.

Senator Lyons then stated he would defer to better language. Chair Sheffer stated to change it to "and stipend."

Senator Lee then asked, where it said eligible - who got to decide? Senator Erickson pointed out it should state, "shall receive." Senator Lyons accepted this friendly amendment.

The Chair called for further discussion of the amendment to the bylaw change. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The amendment passed.

The Chair then called for further discussion of the bylaw change. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The body approved the bylaw change unanimously.

Please see **Appendix G** for the Faculty Senate Budget Report, and Senate Attendance Record during 2001-02.

At this time Senator Harp rose and asked the Senate to thank Mr. Nettling for his dedication to the University. The Senate responded with a warm round of applause.

Chair Sheffer then called for a motion to adjourn. Senator Hajjafar so moved. The motion was seconded and the meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

**Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin**